(ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ)

ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೂ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಅದರಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೇ ಏನನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why was all this trouble taken ? Members must always be precise.

Yesterday I heard the whole debate in my chambers. Most of the discussions that took place and the time consumed was in regard to a limited thing, *viz.*, certain observations made by the hon'ble member when he dealt with the question of inference to be drawn out of the elections, objections were raised and I have seen all that has transpired in these two or three days. Certain things have been said regarding certain other matters, party affiliation, discipline within the party and the relative strength and all that. If any observation of that type is made and particulary in view of what was stated even in the course of the debate, there is absolutely nothing that was wrong. Points of orders were raised. Relevancy is distinctly separate, An irrelevant thing does not become a point of order. A point of order has to conform to the rules.

Today we are raising at 12 noon. If the hon'ble members are anxious for the Tea break we can have it from 10-30 a.m. to 11 a.m. If the time is not to be lost, there will be no break but however there will be Tea table for which I am inviting members.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelgola).—Tea break is not necessary in view of the short time at our disposal.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There will be no break. Tea table will be there.

MOTION TO CONSIDER THE STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF MINISTER REGARDING THE FINANCIAL PORTION OF THE STATE.

(*Debate Continued.*)

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Sankeswar).—Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon'ble member Sri H. Siddaveerappa paid a very warm tribute to the hon'ble Speaker Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga. I must associate myself with whatever he has stated. It is good that he expressed confidence in his sense of impartiality and sound judgment. Now, I am referring to this fact in order to strengthen my argument, as regards the validity of the reason mentioned by the hon'ble Chief Minister in reducing the period of session from 40 days to 5 days. When the Chief Minister placed his difficulties and the necessity to revise the budget, the Hon'ble Speaker

appreciated and considered the whole thing in all its aspects and then thought it was a reasonable thing. The result was that there was a modified programme of business and the period of the session was reduced to 5 days. Therefore, it is for the hon'ble members of this House to consider whether the Chief Minister's request in short-cutting the programme was correct or not. If proof is needed, it is a proof-positive to show that what was done at the request of the hon'ble Chief Minister was correct.

I shall proceed to another point, namely, press reports which suggested that the Opposition in this House wanted to form a shadow cabinet. I think probably it must have been at the initiation of the leading members of the opposition. I welcome the decision very warmly. It is a very good move and it may please be noted that formation of shadow cabinet is not an end in itself. Unless some responsibility is instilled into the frame of this shadow cabinet, mere formulation of shadow cabinet is not going to serve any purpose. There are certain experienced parliamentarians on the other side. I appraciate their intentions. Shadow cabinets are formed in England. The ruling party forms its cabinet and it is in charge of administration. The opposition forms shadow cabinet and consi lers national and international situations from day to day and formulates its policies and whenever any subjects come before the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, the opposition party under the leadership of the shadow cabinet passes constructive criticism, makes healthy proposals and they are discussed in a very healthy and constructive atmosphere. The test of responsibility here is that whatever the Opposition says should be such as is capable of being implemented, if the Opposition is called upon to form the Government. If that is the way in which democracies are to function, particularly parliamentary democracies, then I would request Hon'ble Members of the Opposition to follow the healthy precedents which are created and are being followed in the U.K. from which we have borrowed most of our parliamentary institutions.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SHETTY (Chicknaikanahalli).—Is the hon'ble Member aware that in England the Leader of the Opposition is receiving a monthly salary like the Prime Minister?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The Hon'ble Member Shetty has raised a very relevant point. I wish the Leader of the Opposition is also paid a salary and given all facilities so that he can function as a responsible Leader of the Opposition. That is not the point at issue now. If anything can be done in that behalf, I very sincerely promise that any move on those lines by the Hon'ble Member Sri Shetty and other Members of the Opposition will receive my honest co-operation. The point I am making is what should be the attitude of the Opposition? The question of paying a salary to the Leader of the Opposition is a small point. When we are spending so much upon democratic institutions in this country, the payment of salary to the Leader of the Opposition will be a drop in the ocean. The matter should be raised at the Parliament level

(Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE)

and the needful should be done. What I am urging is that the Opposition should place themselves in a constructive frame of mind so that both the Government side and the Opposition side could work in co-operation with each other to advance the interest of the masses and bring about a Welfare State in India.

I shall now pass on to another point, namely, my analysis as to what has happened during the first three days of the present session. I find that the Members of the Opposition are suffering from a sense of frustration. They probably wanted to come into power. That is a very good ambition, no doubt; I can sympathise with them.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—The imagination of the hon. Member is soaring high and high; if anybody is frustrated, it is only the other side.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Whether it is my imagination or whether it is a reality, I leave the matter to the cool thinking of the Members of the Opposition. They need not give a reply to me here; let them sit and in a cool moment let them say whether what they are saying is correct. Let them appeal to their conscience and say whether what they say is correct.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR. (Tumkur).—Let the hon. Member concentrate his attention to the point at issue and not side-tract and waste the time of the House so that others will have a chance to speak.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The hon. Members of the Opposition tried their best to come to power by all the heterogenous elements coming together without any common ideology.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಗೌರವ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾತಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಆರಂಭವಾಗುವ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಹತ್ವವಾಗಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—The hon. Member is making irrelevant remarks; he can cut short his speech. I have been pointing out from time to time that he is side-tracting and not coming to the point at issue. It seems he wants to continue like this all the three hours at our disposal so that others will not have a chance to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is a big list of members with me who wanted to participate and I will give chances.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸಮಯ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.